IDAHO SDI PROJECT-STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS
SUMMARY NOTES FROM POCATELLO-JUNE 26

Prepared, 7-10-2008

Introduction

These are summary notes from the stakeholder meeting for Idaho Spatial Data Infrastructure Planning Project on June 26, 2008 in Pocatello. The SDI planning project has the main objective of preparing strategic and business plans to guide long-term enhancement and development of a statewide SDI. This is one of 6 regional stakeholder meetings conducted at different locations around the state (other locations include McCall, Lewiston, Post Falls, Twin Falls, Nampa) during the month of June. The purpose of these meetings was to:

- Get input and ideas for achieving the SDI
- Learn about status of stakeholder GIS use, business needs, and ideas on direction and goals
- Build stakeholder understanding of and support for statewide SDI development

Participants are encouraged to submit comments, clarification, additional points, etc. Comments and mark-ups may be submitted in electronic form (highlighted mark-up of this document) by **July 30, 2008**. Please submit via email to Gail Ewart (gail.ewart@cio.idaho.gov) and Peter Croswell (pcroswell@croswell-schulte.com).

Meeting Participants and Contact Information

Name	Organization	Phone/Email Address
Nick Nydegger	State of Idaho Military Division and Idaho Geospatial Committee (IGC) Chair	208-272-4182, nick.nydegger@id.ngb.army.mil
Gail Ewart	Idaho Geospatial Office, State GIO and SDI project manager	208-332-1879, gail.ewart@cio.idaho.gov
Peter Croswell	Croswell-Schulte IT Consultants, contracted facilitator and project manager	502-848-8827, pcroswell@croswell-schulte.com
Scott Van Hoff	US Geological Survey, State Liaison	890-6092, svanhoff@usgs.gov
Chris James	Custer County Assessor	879-2325, custera@custertel.net
Jeff Servatius	Idaho State Tax Commission	334-7750, jservatius@tax.idaho.gov
Eric Smith	Teton County GIS	354-2593 ext. 2115, esmith@co.teton.id.us
Craig Rindlisbacher	Madison County/City of Rexburg GIS	craigr@rexburg.org
Kindra Serr	Idaho State University GIS TREC	282-6078, serrkind@isu.edu
Keith Weber	Idaho State University GIS TREC	282-2757, webekeit@isu.edu
Rajendar Bajracharya	Idaho State University Geomatic Tech.	282-5705, bajraje@isu.edu
Jessica Mitchell	Idaho State University GIS	201-3983, mitcjess@isu.edu
Sherry Lufkin	Jefferson County GIS	745-9215, slufkin@co.jefferson.id.us
Bonnie Moore	Fremont County	bmoore@co.fremont.id.us
Joyce Briggs	Jefferson County	jbriggs@co.jefferson.id.us
Dawn Leatham	Bonneville County GIS	529-1350 ext 1294, dleatham@co.bonneville.id.us
Martha Mousel	US Forest Service	557-5817, mmousel@fs.fed.us
Linda Tedrow	Idaho State University-Graduate student	232-4685, tedrlind@isu.edu
Sean Harwood	US Forest Service	801-625-5213, sharwood@fs.fed.us
Rayce Ruiz	Idaho Transportation Dept.	745-7781, rayce.ruiz@itd.idaho.gov

Meeting Agenda

1. Welcome and Introduction
2. Business Drivers and Business Needs for GIS
3. High-level Characterization of GIS Status and Obstacles
4. Geospatial Data Activities and Needs

5. Ideas for Improvements to Statewide GIS Access and Coordination
6. Brainstorm Session on Mission, Vision, and Goals for Implementing Idaho's Spatial Information Infrastructure
7. Summarize Results of Meeting and Identify Follow-up

Summary Notes

Business Drivers (major program area, need, or challenge that GIS technology and geospatial data can help support or address)

- Workforce Knowledge and Skills: GIS technology stimulates needs and programs for technical education and training of the workforce. Provides industry incentive.
- GIS supports better response to public: GIS is a primary tool to support public requests for information (e.g., real property data) including general inquiries and questions about appraisals or to support appeals. Also, access to Web-based tools by the public (including Google Earth) provides public with a basis to check data from government agencies and drive data quality improvements.
- GIS technology as an "integrator": GIS can be used as a basis to integrate systems, databases, and a wide range of disciplines
- Data integrity: GIS use to encourage and support higher data quality to support decision making, legal challenges, etc. High data quality creates confidence in use of GIS.
- Property Appraisal reviews: GIS is very effective tool to support Board of Equalization review of property appraisals and provides support to "defend" appraisals in formal appeals
- Access to history information: GIS can be used to access history information useful for many applications: examining "grandfather" claims in land use decisions, zoning actions, etc.
- Support for economic development decisions. Reference made to ID Economic Development Information System (IEDIS)
- Support for comprehensive planning
- Support for planning decisions associated with transportation corridor studies (examining parcel ownership, traffic information, etc.)
- Tourism information and promotion: Web-based map information providing travel and tourist information to promote visitation. USFS use of GIS to provide information on trails, ATV access.
- Public Safety support: use of GIS in disaster planning and emergency response
- Labor efficiency: Labor savings from easier access to information and improved workflows making use of automated tools. Use GIS to avoid costs from new programs and demands
- Coordination among departments and programs resulting in savings
- Real Property Appraisal/Taxation: Use GIS to provide for a more equitable and consistent appraisal of property. GIS is used to examine properties to find undertaxed parcels.
- Increased Public Demand: Public demand for information and quick response from government agencies, as well as having information and services available on-line (Web) puts government agencies in a position to respond to this increased demand expectation. GIS is a tool that can help government workers quickly find information for response to questions. GIS also supports a variety of e-gov applications for public Web access.
- Support for County Commissioner Decisions: Role for access to GIS and imagery to support decision making by County Commissions—need for direct access at Commission meetings?
- Land use and Growth Trend Analysis
- Rangeland/Cattle Industry support: use of GIS for analysis of vegetation and range health and analysis of management practices to support health of rangeland

Current GIS Status, Obstacles, Limitations

- Lack of coordination among departments and organizations: this limits access to information sources that could be used to support useful GIS analysis
- Ambiguity in Public Records Law: The state Public Records Law does not clearly address aspects of access to and distribution of GIS data—what data can be released, what are the terms of use by a third party, should distribution policies differ between public access and use by private companies. There is a need for clarification in the law and policies for GIS data distribution and statewide consistency in distribution, license terms, fees.
- Geographic Data Duplication: Data redundancy and duplication in maintenance of geographic data sets within the same jurisdiction (e.g., government agency departments maintaining different versions of street centerlines, subdivisions information, address databases). Results in inconsistency in data maintenance, lower confidence in data quality, and more resources in data maintenance.
- Staff Limitations: Difficulty in finding trained people, providing sufficient in-house training, and avoiding staff turnover (trained staff leave for other jobs)
- Barriers to Organizational Coordination: Sometimes missions of individual agencies work against collaboration or do not encourage sharing of resources. Statewide, there are 44 individual counties managing geographic data in different ways. There are insufficient mechanisms in place for collaboration and information sharing. Part of this is exhibited in "turf wars" among state agencies.
- Vendor Influence: Sometimes, influence from vendors forces unwise technology decisions by government agencies.
- Statewide Disparity in Available Resources: State has wide range in jurisdictional population and available resources and finding sources for technology initiatives. Many low resource cities and counties not able to launch GIS programs.
- GIS data boundary correspondence: Observations about key problems with proper correspondence between boundaries on different GIS layers: a) parcel correspondence with governmental and taxing unit boundaries, b) Census Bureau—enumeration districts for 2010 census have not been compiled with local data (with exception of a few areas like Ada County, Bonneville County) so there may be lack of correspondence with local GIS data
- Parcels: Formats for digital parcel mapping statewide are not consistent and accuracy levels vary. Not sufficient coordination and articulation of standards to support statewide consistency in parcel mapping.
- Timing in parcel map update: The parcel mapping process requires an annual snapshot of parcels to support creation of the tax roll each year. This yearly cycle can create confusion with parcel updates that are on-going all the time (parcel splits, merges, subdivision). Need proper workflows, controls, and update applications to avoid confusion and conflicts.
- GIS is not a licensed profession, so our effects are below the radar. However, Idaho law now requires a cadastral specialist at each county.
- There's a knowledge gap between surveyors and GIS professionals
- The IGC does not have a prominent-enough role and position. It is not known statewide at a high-enough level.
- Local governments have a state mandated 3% annual budget increase cap. This is in addition to budget increases related to growth. This creates an obstacle to launching new GIS-related initiatives that require special funding.

Geospatial Data Status and Needs

- Framework Themes: Gail Ewart discussed current Idaho Framework Data Themes (commonly needed data by majority of stakeholders) with idea that this definition can be adapted as part of this SDI project. Current Idaho Framework Themes are a) Geodetic Control, b) Cadastral, c) Orthoimagery, d) Transportation, e) Land Use/Land Cover, f) Hydrography/Watersheds, g) Elevation, h) Governmental Units.
- Status of Framework development work at state level:
  - GIO preparing proposed process for standards making and approval
  - Imagery – 2009 NAIP partnership purchase. Contribution commitments & upgrade needs
  - Cadastral Reference (updating GCDB). Assessors and surveyors are also involved; plans are beginning to gel; led by Sheldon Bluestein
  - Parcels – working on goals and objectives for statewide ownership; led by Craig Rindlisbacher and Jeff Servatius
  - Geodetic Control – ITD has agreed to be the lead agency for Height Modernization. Next steps include writing a proposal
  - Road Centerlines – About half the counties are partners in this statewide effort led by folks in northern Idaho

- Orthoimagery: Gail Ewart discussed current project in place for full state coverage of orthoimagery as part of Farm Service Agency National Agricultural Imagery Program (NAIP). This will deliver 1-meter resolution (3-bands) statewide with opportunity for increased resolution and IR band for selected areas. This is leaf-on coverage. Mechanism is set-up to support contributions of funding for consortium purchase. NAIP funding commitments must be made by 12/2008 but contributions of funding not needed until 2010.
- Orthoimagery: General acknowledgement that statewide 1-meter NAIP imagery is of value. Main concern is about getting access to the imagery in a user-friendly way. Also concern about the file format options. Expressed need for an easy-to-use Web-based imagery access service and ability to combine imagery on the Web with locally stored GIS data. Recommended to stick with relative control until Height Modernization is done.
- Orthoimagery: Need at least 6-inch resolution, leaf-off imagery to support many GIS applications in urban areas. It was mentioned that yearly refights for acquisition of 1-meter imagery could support less frequent reflights of 6-inch imagery to support analysis of change.
- Worldview 2 satellite: There was mention made of the Worldview 2 Satellite (from Digital Globe) that will deliver .25 meter resolution imagery in 2009.
- Governmental Units: Gail Ewart mentioned that there will be a new working group established to explore standards and initiatives for governmental unit data.
- Governmental Units: there are still problems with boundary correspondence between governmental boundaries and parcels
- Governmental Units: problems with defining accurate County boundaries in areas where survey records are not good or monumentation is not recovered. General acknowledgement to address these boundary concerns on a case-by-case basis and fix them incrementally. It was mentioned that the Census Bureau has been assigned, through Federal Law, responsibility as the source of state boundary information.
- Parcels: most counties in the state are capturing parcel boundaries in some digital form but format and accuracy levels vary greatly. Tax Commission has some formal data sharing agreements in place to get digital data from counties (5 formal agreements) and informal agreements with 30 counties. Working toward formal agreements with additional counties
- Federal Land Parcels: There is not a great emphasis on accurate mapping of parcels on federal land (not in private ownership). But federal land parcel mapping is important to local governments in some cases: a) where private land is intermingled with federal land ownership, b) wildland/urban interface. It would be nice for counties to have information in the specific federal agency responsible for federal land tracts (this information is not always available to County Assessors).
- Digital Parcel Mapping: County Assessor's need more support and clearly defined standards and direct support to encourage consistent parcel mapping. There is currently a survey out to County Assessors asking for parcel mapping and GIS status and needs. Results will be processed by the Fall of 2008.
- Public land: There is not accurate mapping or attributing of publicly owned land (federal & state agencies, local govs). The Idaho Geospatial Office is developing a system to track land and facilities owned or leased by the State. May require incremental improvement (perhaps with some field surveying) to establish accurate boundaries.
- Data Access security: Very important to establish sound data security practices and tools to properly assign roles and permissions and protect GIS data from damage or corruption. Need to clearly define who is the data custodian.
- Vertical Data: discussion about how to capture 3-D data (e.g., underground infrastructure). Issue of sometimes ambiguity of vertical datum for assigning a vertical coordinate or attribute. Can assign elevation or depth but datum or reference point not always known.
- Soils Data: about half the state is covered with detailed soil surveys (SSURGO) from the NRCS. There is not a statewide consistent set of soil type classifications. Soils data is used in rural land property appraisal.
- Elevation data: State has full coverage of USGS DEM data (10-meter resolution). This is useful for general topographic analysis but has horizontal and vertical accuracy problems. One user described problems in use for drainage analysis because many drainage lines were missed when DEM data was portraying topographic surface. This is a limitation of the vertical and horizontal accuracy as well as the resolution of the DEM file.
- Census Bureau LUCA program: Participation in this program to provide updates to Census Bureau has created privacy concerns (for site address data)
- Buildings/Structures: detailed outlines of buildings could be useful to support public safety applications.
- Survey Data Update/Augmentation: Need a mechanism to gather updated survey coordinates and monumentation data for PLSS corners collected by private surveyors or through government contracts. Follow Montana model.
- Climate: SOGS mentioned was made of this system (the Surface Observation and Gridding System) from NASA that provides modeled weather data by 250-meter grid (temperature, precip)

- Natural Hazard data: it was pointed out that hazard data may be complex and dynamic (actual occurrence of hazards) so is difficult to map. This compares with more stable conditions (slope, floodplains, etc.) or intrinsic data that contribute to the hazard threats
- Development Restrictions: There are a variety of GIS data themes of importance to local governments in making development decisions. These boundaries are not always mapped well, making it difficult for land use development reviews and decisions. This includes such information as comp plan, conservation easements, floodplain boundaries, and clustering agreements.
- NGS gravity modeling: NGS is carrying out gravity surveys that contribute to more accurate geoid modeling. IPLS considering code for GPS standards
- Need full set of tools to allow all users and software to work with the statewide map projection/coordinate system (IDTM)
- Emergency services management data: need to capture GIS data on critical facilities (government buildings, public safety facilities, medical facilities). Also could use information on threat vulnerability.

Discussion on Draft Vision and Mission (reaction to draft Vision and Mission statements prepared by the Executive Steering Committee)

Draft Vision:

"Idaho's spatial data infrastructure is widely used to enhance and expedite public- and private-sector policies and decisions for the benefit of Idahoans and beyond"

Draft Mission:

"Idaho's geospatial community will deliver a robust statewide spatial data infrastructure that supports routine and extraordinary business needs"

- Vision: reference to "public, private sector" is not clear or inclusive enough. Should it be omitted?
- Vision: "…Idahoans and beyond" is fuzzy term
- Should be clear that the vision and mission are about people and organizations' ability to use SDI, not just SDI itself.
- Mission: the term "business" is OK
- Mission: change "extraordinary" to "unique"?
- Make sure to keep Vision and Mission consistent
- Mission: maybe replace "robust" with another word like "modern", "reliable", "fully supports"
- Mission: possible modified wording: "….supporting our diverse business needs"

Discussion on Draft Goals (reaction to draft Vision and Mission statements prepared by the Executive Steering Committee)

Draft Goals:

1. Secure sustained funding to support SDI implementation and management by the end of 2010.
2. Develop and establish pathways for stewarding Framework data by March 1, 2009.
3. Create and effectively communicate a sound business case for the SDI that promotes alignment of investments in spatial data and technology by the end of June 30, 2009.
4. Support regional GIS user groups and establish or enhance regional centers to aggregate and extend access to Framework and the technology to use it, with emphasis on low-resourced jurisdictions and organizations not able to maintain GIS capability on their own beginning in 2009.
5. Conceive and implement an improved governance and coordination structure, with appropriate legislation, policies, and management practices that support realization of the SDI by the end of 2009.
6. Support local data development through collaboratively developing standards, supporting partnerships, and providing funding by July 1, 2010.
7. Create an effective communication, education and support environment and tools that increase awareness, broad support, and wide use of the SDI.
8. Expand the use of spatial data and technology into new business areas.

- Consider arranging goals in order of priority or timing
- #4: what is the role of the regional centers? Not clear in this goal

- #1: move lower—maybe avoid focus on funding in the goals
- Make sure there is not an undue focus on technology
- #5: Maybe drop the term "governance" since its meaning is not clear to all
- #8: need to clarify the sense of this goal—pushing use of geographic data and functions into new areas not traditionally the focus of GIS technology

Potential Initiatives (ideas on important initiatives to be cited in the strategic and business plans for SDI development)

- Set-up easy-to-use Web-based imagery service for access to orthoimagery at different resolutions and allow users to easily combine locally stored data
- Use NAIP-based funding mechanism to support future reflights and to fund higher resolution orthoimagery capture for urban areas. Establish long-term, sustained program for imagery refresh.
- Set-up Web-based service to allow direct entry of revised survey coordination data for PLSS corners collected by private surveyors and through government project contacts. Note: NGS has Web-based tool to provide this capabilities
- Coordinate with URISA NR Chapter to support statewide coordination and education
- Coordinate better with the Assessors Mapping Committee
- Explore limitations with current public records access laws and clarify confusion about GIS data access and potential personal privacy concerns (property data)
- Regional Centers: pursue the concept of regional centers and focus on appropriate "roles" for the centers. Roles, or the purpose of centers could be: a) foster communication among professionals in regional areas, b) serving data, c) technical support and training, d) provide higher level of redundancy and fault tolerance in data storage and access. It is important to make sure there is solid coordination with state SDI management in Boise. This means an effective organizational structure, assigned roles, and oversight. Could a regional center model be based on State Tax Commission regional offices and contact with counties?
- Regional Centers: Another concept could be focused on lead function: INSIDE Idaho (north) on data access and distribution strategies, ISU (southeast) on training and research, and Boise (southwest) on policy, standards and coordination
- Regional Centers: it was acknowledged that effective communication and coordination requires some level and opportunities for in-person contact so using the regional center concept to encourage contact among people in a region is important. This regional collaboration and communication is going on now but can be formalized and strengthened. Useful in technology transfer and mutual support.
- Data standards need to be formalized and need some "teeth." Formalization followed by MOAs to establish commitments for use. Development and adoption of GIS standards relating to data format, data entity naming, and metadata are not sufficiently mature or well-communicated to user organizations.
- Senior Official Education/Outreach: Develop better tools and materials that focus on business needs, not technical jargon.
- Engage and "enlist" one or more senior, influential "champions" to provide support and help promote the SDI effort in legislative bodies and senior executive offices.

Other Information and Ideas

- Workforce Knowledge and Skills: need to keep technical skills high in order to use GIS technology effectively
- Gail Ewart discussed the recent move for the Idaho Geospatial Office to develop a system state to track all land and facilities owned or leased by the State Mention of "Idaho View" as part of "America View" program
- Need to find ways to engage citizens and general public. This generates ground-up interest and can help get legislative support.
- Local governments have a state mandated 3% annual budget increase cap. This is in addition to budget increases related to growth.
- State certification: State tax Commission is creating a new certification, "Cadastral Specialist" to replace the current "mapper" certification to address GIS issues.

- Mention of RedZone software for field mapping of fire threats
- NGS has Web-based service for registered surveyors to submit survey data directly
- It is important, in SDI planning, to anticipate future technology changes and set goals that reflect likely future technology conditions. GeoWeb, federated GIS.
- GLOBE program: NASA/NSF program for Science Education: possible a model for broad GIS education
- The SDI effort could make use of a Champion and support at the state legislative level
- Bonneville County now has a consultant conducting an analysis of GIS data use and business process workflows **should get results of this.
- Federal agencies (not including DHS and DoD) are spending $85M annually on imagery; Imagery for the Nation is estimated to cost only $20M annually.